

**SEPA IWG**  
**September 30, 2008**  
**Decision Guide**

**Threshold Determination**

A. In regards to statewide consistency in setting significance standards, what should the state require lead agencies to do? Possible responses are below:

1. Implement statewide standard
2. Use State Standard or Adopt Local Standard WITH State Sideboards
3. Use State Standard or Adopt Local Standard WITHOUT State Sideboards
4. Adopt Local Standard WITH State Sideboards
5. Adopt Local Standard WITHOUT State Sideboards
6. No Required Local Standard
7. Don't know/Can't decide at this point

*(Note: The term "sideboards" is used above to potentially include state guidance, rule, or statute. The specific nature of the sideboards would be determined later.)*

B. If there some type of statewide standard (required or optional) , what type of standard should it be?

1. Percentage-based (e.g., % reduction from business as usual)
2. Volume-based (e.g., tons/unit, tons/year)
3. Hybrid of percentage and volume
4. Other type of standard
5. Don't know/Can't decide at this point

C. Should the IWG recommend that Ecology and its stakeholders develop approaches that allow proposals to qualitatively achieve a "Determination of non-significance" (e.g., a "green list," conformance with a climate plan, etc.) *(Note: specific approach would be determined later)*

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/Can't decide at this point

D. Should the state link the significance standard (or standards) to the state's greenhouse gas emissions goals in some way?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/Can't decide at this point

**Vulnerability and Adaptation**

E. Should the IWG recommend that the SEPA checklist be revised to include a consideration of vulnerabilities as part of the SEPA analysis? *[Note: IWG will have specific concept/language to review]*

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/Can't decide at this point

### **Bucket 3 Ideas for Leveraging SEPA**

F. For each of the short list of ideas put forward by the Bucket 3 group, should the IWG:

1. Recommend the idea to the CAT and Ecology in the final report?
2. Recommend that the idea be further analyzed and considered by the CAT and/or Ecology?
3. Not recommend the idea for further consideration?

*(Note: the IWG will have write-ups of these ideas to review before September 30)*

### **Measurement Tools**

G. Should the SEPA IWG recommend the development and funding of specific types of easy to use tools?

If so, which ones? *[Note: IWG will have specific recommendation language to review]*

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/Can't decide at this point

H. Should the SEPA IWG recommend that qualitative analysis of emissions is allowed and encouraged in the near term while measurement tools are being developed? *[Note: IWG will have specific recommendation language to review]*

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know